



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
*ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT*  
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

www.howardcountymd.gov

410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-1655

TDD 410-313-2323

## June Agenda

Thursday, June 3, 2010; 7:00 p.m.

The sixth regular meeting of the Historic District Commission will be held at 8930 Stanford Blvd., Columbia, Maryland 21045 in the Tyson II Room. All cases are public meetings unless otherwise indicated. All inquiries should be made to: 410-313-2350. Requests for accommodations need to be made three working days in advance of the meeting. Materials are available in alternative formats upon request.

### **PLANS FOR APPROVAL**

1. #10-17 – 8429-8433 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. #06-69c – 5471 Old Columbia Road, Ellicott City, HO-430
3. #10-18 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
4. #10- 19 – 8484-B Frederick Road, Ellicott City
5. #10-20 – 3879 College Avenue, Ellicott City, HO-355
6. #10-21 – 8448 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-315

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **#10-17 – 8429-8433 Main Street, Ellicott**

Replace roof, exterior painting, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Twilley Home Improvements

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the buildings date to 1900. The Applicant proposes to remove the current asphalt shingle roofs and replace them with grey Tamko Heritage 30 year laminated asphalt architectural shingles. The Applicant also proposes to repaint the white building's siding and trim and brick building's trim; all will remain white. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for all work.

**Staff Comments:** The current roofs are not constructed with historic building materials, but are asphalt shingle. The replacement roof will be an in-kind change. The Application is consistent with Chapter 6.E recommendations, "use asphalt shingles that are flat, uniform in color and texture and of a neutral color." As outlined in Chapter 5, painting the buildings the same colors is considered routine maintenance. This item is listed because it requires tax credit pre-approval.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of roof replacement as submitted and tax credit pre-approval.

## **REGULAR DISCUSSION AGENDA**

### **#06-69c – 5471 Old Columbia Road, Ellicott City, HO-430**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Frank Collins

**Background & Scope of Work:** The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$8,540.00 was spent to waterproof the interior and exterior foundation walls of the house. The tax credit was pre-approved on December 7, 2006. The Applicant seeks \$854.00 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The waterproofing complies with the work pre-approved. There are expenses for a plumber and electrician, which are not commonly found to be eligible expenses because they are usually associated with interior finish work, which is not an eligible expense. However, because this project involved waterproofing of the interior foundation, Staff finds the expenses were necessary for the work to be completed. The plumber had to dig a trench along the west wall of the dining room in order to install a drain pipe to the new sump pump. The electrician had to remove and later re-install the existing electrical service, which was attached to the stone foundation, in order for the plumbing work to be completed.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of final tax credit for \$854.00.

### **#10-18 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City**

Install sign, paint exterior.

Applicant: Sheela Lal

**Background & Scope of Work:** The Applicant proposes to replace the current sign for The Well, which is painted on the building, with a wooden powder coated flat mounted sign. The Applicant also proposes to change the accent color scheme of the building, which is currently a bright green and blue, to black and red. The primary beige color on the building will remain the same.

The sign will have a beige background, with red text and a black border and read on two lines:

Ooh la Lal

Hair Salon

**Staff Comments:** The Applicant originally proposed to paint a sign on the building as the previous tenants had, but painted signs are not allowed by the Sign Code and the Commission would not have been able to approve the sign. The Applicant then submitted a revised design proposal for the flat mounted sign. The proposed sign will be 4.5 feet tall by 12 feet wide, for a total of 54 square feet. Chapter 11.B (page 83) of the Guidelines recommends “in most cases, limit the area of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of 8 square feet in area for any one sign. More sign area is appropriate for some of Ellicott City’s larger buildings, where these limits would result in signs that are ineffective or not in scale with the building.” This building is wider than many buildings found in Ellicott City and is not highly visible from Old Columbia Pike. The building is set back from the road, the view is blocked by another building and the most visible part of the building is the right side where the sign is proposed to be mounted. However, the proposed dimensions are significantly larger than the Guidelines recommend. Staff recommends the sign be

reduced to a total of 20 to 25 square feet. Staff suggests the Commission approve a total square footage range, but leave the actual dimensions to the sign maker.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval of the new paint color scheme for the building. Staff recommends Approval of the sign contingent upon reduced dimensions to conform more closely to the Guidelines, but still be an effective sign.

**#10-19 – 8484-B Frederick Road, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations and additions, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Ellicott City Properties, Inc.

**Background & Scope of Work:** This one-story, one-bedroom cottage is located behind 8484-A Frederick Road, which was built around 1920, according to MDAT. The subject house was most likely built around the same time period. The Applicant proposes to renovate the house, add a second story one-bedroom addition to the rear wing of the “L-shaped” house and raise the existing stone foundation so that the house will be further off the ground to fix water related foundation problems.

The chart below outlines the proposed changes:

#	Item	Existing Material/Color	Proposed Material/Color	Tax Credit Pre-Approval
1	Painting	White siding and trim	White siding and trim	Seeking
2	Installing Roofing	Rust colored metal and asphalt shingle	Forest Green standing seam metal	Seeking
3	Installing Windows	White wood 6:6	Anderson 200 series vinyl clad wood 6:6	Seeking
4	Installing Siding	White fiber cement shingles	White German wood siding	Seeking
5	Installing Doors	White wood	Forest Green 6-panel fiberglass	Seeking
6	Raising Foundation	Stone	Local stone to grade	Seeking
7	Porch Decking	Doesn't currently exist	Grey tongue and groove composition boards	Seeking
8	Porch Railing	Doesn't currently exist	White wood, with a Forest Green top rail	Seeking
9	Exterior Lighting	Doesn't currently exist	Black metal	n/a
10	Extend Sidewalk	Concrete	Concrete	n/a

**Staff Comments:** The proposed addition does not strictly adhere to the Guideline (page 52), “attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade” or “design additions so that the form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired if the addition were to be removed in the future.” The addition is to the rear, but it will alter the primary façade and is unlikely to be removed in the future. However, the addition is compatible with the design of the house; the only significant change is to the overall height of the rear portion of the house. The shape of the roof remains the same and the roof will be replaced entirely in standing seam metal instead of the current asphalt shingle and metal combination. Although the second floor is an addition, the rest of the house will remain the same.

Chapter 6.E recommends “maintain original roof lines and dormers.” The current gabled roof lines will remain the same. A standing seam metal roof is currently on the building, the continued use of this material is consistent with Chapter 7.A of the Guidelines, “replace historic roof materials only when necessary due to extensive deterioration; use replacement material that matches or is similar to the original.”

Chapter 6.H (page 40-41) of the Guidelines recommends against “replacing wood windows with metal or vinyl” but finds that wood windows clad with a permanent finish are a good, low maintenance alternative” when not highly visible. Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval for Item #3, the Anderson 200 series vinyl clad wood windows, but would recommend tax credit pre-approval if a wood, non-clad, window was used. However, staff has no objection to the use of the vinyl clad wood window as it is not visible from the public right-of-way. If the Commission was to approve tax credits for this item, only existing windows on the first floor would be eligible for the credit.

The Applicant proposes to replace the current asbestos siding with German wood siding. The replacement of the asbestos with a German wood siding is consistent with Chapter 6.D (page 30) recommendations, “remove asbestos shingles, aluminum siding or other coverings from historic buildings and repair or restore the original wall material.”

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing wood doors with green 6-panel fiberglass doors. Chapter 6.G (page 37) of the Guidelines recommends “maintain and repair original doors” and “when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish.” Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval for the fiberglass doors, Item #5, because the replacement will not be in-kind. If the Applicant was to install wooden doors, staff would recommend tax credit pre-approval. However, staff has no objection to the fiberglass door as it is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The proposed black exterior lighting fixture is consistent with Chapter 9.E (page 71), “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material.” Chapter 9.D (page 70) explains, “patios and walkways can be a variety of materials...but concrete walks are typical in many areas.” The sidewalk extension is consistent with the Guidelines.

The Applicant proposes to reconstruct a porch, which the Applicant has indicated previously existed on the building. The porch floor will be constructed with 4-inch grey composite decking to resemble tongue and groove wood boards and the railings will be wood, painted white with a Forest Green top rail. Staff would only recommend tax credit pre-approval if the Applicant can show old photos indicating the porch originally existed and if the decking is wood.

Staff is concerned that the building appears to be severely deteriorated. If the Applicant finds the renovation and addition to be not feasible they are advised that demolition requires approval from the Historic District Commission and new construction is not eligible for tax credits.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of Items 1-10 as submitted.
- 2) Tax credit pre-approval for Items 1, 2, 4 and 6.
- 3) Tax credit pre-approval for Items 3 and 5 if they are wood (existing windows only).
- 4) Tax credit pre-approval for Items 7 and 8 contingent upon the Applicant proving a porch historically existed and if the material used is wood.

**#10-20 – 3879 College Avenue, Ellicott City, HO-355**

Exterior alterations and repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Maria Rodriguez

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the building dates to 1899. The house is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-355, Lilburn Cottage. The Applicant proposes to make several repairs to the house, including some site improvements. The Applicant explained that the driveway slopes toward the house, allowing rainwater to drain toward the house. This has caused damage to the interior of the house and foundation. The Applicant proposes to widen the driveway and correct the slope. The driveway currently extends to the middle of the house, but the Applicant would like to remove the asphalt driveway and small stone patio at the main entrance on the side of the house and replace it with a patio of stone pavers in Harvest Gold. The driveway would be shortened to the front corner of the house and the patio area would be expanded. A low retaining wall would be constructed along the north side of the driveway along the neighboring property line.

Repairs and alterations to the house include:

#	Item	Existing Material/Color	Proposed Material/Color	Tax Credits
1	Replace/extend patio	Stone	Harvest Gold pavers	n/a
2	Widen and repave driveway	Gray Asphalt	Gray asphalt	Seeking
3	Replace doors and frames/add storm doors	Painted 4-panel wood	Dark brown wood and glass	Seeking
4	Sand and paint shutters	Forest Green wood	Forest Green wood	Seeking
5	Replace porch ceilings and railings	White/off-white painted wood	Wood , leave natural, no paint	Seeking
6	Replace porch floor	Unknown , painted off-white	Natural colored composite	Seeking
7	Repair stone foundation walls	n/a	n/a	Seeking
8	Repair holes in siding and paint	Beige wood/vinyl (exact material unknown)	Beige wood/vinyl (current color)	Seeking
9	Install retaining wall	Stone	Harvest Gold pavers	n/a

**Staff Comments:** The Applicant proposes to widen and repave the driveway, which is currently narrow, broken and sloped towards the house, causing water problems to the house. The Applicant intends to correct the drainage problems through repaving. The driveway will be widened to the stone wall on the south side and to the property line on the north side. A small retaining wall will be constructed on the north side of the driveway to eliminate the slope in this area and to aid with drainage problems. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the repaving of the driveway, however Staff does not recommend tax credit pre-approval for this item because only a small portion of the driveway affects the house, not the entire length of the driveway. The patio will be expanded by the front entrance and the driveway will no longer stop directly in front of the house. The Applicant proposes to use stone pavers in Harvest Gold to construct the patio and retaining wall.

The existing doors are solid 4-panel doors. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing front door with a wooden dark brown, two-panel, two-lite door. The Applicant would also like to add a storm door, which will be a single-lite door with a wooden frame. The Applicant proposes to replace the back door with a 15-lite French door and add a single-lite storm door with two small panels on the bottom. The replacement front door is consistent with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish.” Chapter 6.G (page 38) states “many historic buildings have secondary entrances not visible from streets or other properties. Where these entrances already have a modern replacement door, a new door does not necessarily need to be of a historically appropriate style.” It is unknown if the rear door is the original door, but the proposed French door is an appropriate type and Staff understands the door will allow more light into the home. The door is not visible from the public right-of-way.

Sanding and painting the shutters and repairing the holes in the stone foundation and siding comply with Chapter 5 guidelines for routine maintenance, as long as the materials are replaced in-kind. The Applicant proposes to replace the porch ceiling and railings and leave them unpainted. Chapter 6.F of the Guidelines finds “materials generally not appropriate for historic porch replacements include unpainted pressure-treated wood.” Staff recommends the railings and ceiling be painted to match the existing, which appears to be white and off-white. The Applicant also proposes to replace the porch flooring with a composite, although it currently appears to be wood, painted off-white. Chapter 6.F of the Guidelines recommends “replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in material design and finish.” If the porch flooring is currently wood, a composite material would not be eligible for tax credits. Staff recommends the porch flooring be replaced with wood.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of Items 1-4 and 7-9.
- 2) Approval of Item 5, contingent upon railings being painted white and off-white to match existing.
- 3) Approval of Item 6, contingent upon the floor being replaced with wood.
- 4) Tax credit pre-approval for Items 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8
- 5) Tax credit pre-approval for Item 6 if replaced with wood.

**#10-21 – 8448 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-315**

Exterior alterations and additions.

Applicant: Erik and Laura Steensen

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT, the building dates to 1800. The building is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-315, the George Burgess House. The Applicants, who have not yet purchased the property, propose to build a rear addition which will consist of two new structures connected to the existing historic house. The arrangement of the additions will create a U-shaped building framing a courtyard. The Applicants propose to construct a 24 foot by 14 foot in-ground pool in the courtyard area and extend the driveway around the side of the house to access the addition.

The structure on the west side will be a one-story 27-foot by 42-foot in-law suite. The structure on the east side will be a two-story 22-foot by 34-foot master bedroom suite. Both of the additions will be connected to the existing structure by one-story hallways.

The Applicant also proposes to add four windows to an existing barn on the property in order to adapt the barn for use as an art studio (private use, not a commercial use). There is an existing shed which is currently connected to the historic house. The shed will be relocated to the rear of the yard.

The chart below outlines the proposed work:

#	Item	Proposed Material	Proposed Color
1	Siding	Hardieplank smooth lap siding	White trim, beige siding
2	Roofing	GAF Slateline shingles and metal roof	Antique slate and black
3	Windows	Kolbe wood 6:6 simulated divided lites	White
4	Doors	Kolbe 2-panel 9-lite wood	White
5	Patio	Red brick pavers and grate edge around pool	Red brick, granite
6	Exterior lighting	Progress wall mounted	Black
7	Install windows in barn	Kolbe wood 6:6 simulated divided lites	White

**Staff Comments:** The application is consistent with Chapter 7.A recommendations for new additions. The Guidelines (page 52) recommend “attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade” and “design additions so that the form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired if the addition were to be removed in the future. “

The use of Hardieplank siding on the additions complies with Chapter 7.A (page 52-53) recommendations “design additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new” and “on any building, use exterior materials and colors similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building. Avoid exact replication that would make an addition appear to be an original part of a historic building.”

The front of the house is oriented to Frederick Road, although it gains access from Ellicott Mills Drive. The house is set back from both roads on a wooded lot and is hardly visible from either street when the trees are in leaf; it is unlikely to be highly visible even in winter. Although the proposed additions are large, they sit back from and are perpendicular to the main façade of the house, which will reduce their visual impact. Chapter 7.A (page 52) recommends “design an addition to be subordinate to the historic building in size, height, scale and detail and to allow the form of the original structure to be seen. Distinguish the addition from the original structure by using a setback or offset.” The proposed additions comply with the Guidelines.

The Applicant has not submitted pictures of the proposed doors, but stated they are Kolbe white wooden 2-panel, 9-lite doors. Chapter 7.A recommends, “use doors and simple entrance designs that are compatible with those on the existing building or similar buildings nearby.” Staff has requested a specification sheet with a picture of the proposed door. The windows will be 6:6 white wood Kolbe with simulated divided lites. The wood windows comply with Chapter 7.A (page 52 and 53) recommendations for new construction, “design windows to be similar in size, proportion and arrangement to existing windows and “on any building, use exterior material and colors similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building.”

The Applicant has indicated a driveway will be constructed around the west side of the house to provide parking and access to the west wing addition. The site is quite steep where the driveway would be located and Staff is concerned about the potential need for grading, retaining walls and tree removal. Staff would like to see a site plan addressing these concerns.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.
- 2) Approval of Item 4, contingent upon seeing an appropriate specification sheet.

Staff recommends a landscape plan be submitted for either staff or Commission review to provide more information regarding the installation of the driveway, as grading, tree removal and retaining walls may be needed.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Elmina J. Hilsenrath, ASLA  
Executive Secretary

T:\DPZ\Shared\RCD\HDC\Agendas\2010 Agendas\06 June Agenda.docx